

Remarks/Arguments

**Amendment to Claims**

Claims 1 and 31 were previously allowed, but upon review, Applicant has identified amendments to better state the invention.

In claim 1, the limitation “dividing said service territory into a plurality of unassigned cells” has been amended to recite “dividing said service territory into a plurality of unassigned cells, wherein a subset of said unassigned cells is associated with a grid segment” so as to introduce the “grid segment” limitation earlier in the claim.

Subsequently, in various locations, the limitation “each of said plurality of unassigned cells” is more replaced with the limitation “the grid segment”, which refers to the subset of unassigned cells. Applicant submits this rewording makes the claim easier to comprehend.

Applicant has amended the limitation regarding “grid segment visiting frequency” to correct an error. Previously, the recitation of “wherein said grid segment visiting frequency represents a comparison between a number of stops in said cell by said driver during said reference period and a total number of stops by said driver during said reference period.” As such, the comparison of the same driver’s stops in a cell for the same period would result in a 1:1 comparison, producing a frequency rate of 1. Obviously, the determination of a driver’s frequency is relative to the staff of drivers (and not to the driver himself). Thus, claims 1 and 31 have been amended to recite “said staff of drivers” as indicated.

In addition, with respect to the “classifying” limitation of claim 1, it has been amended to recite “classifying ~~each~~ of said subset of said unassigned cells associated with said grid segment” to clarify that only the cells in a grid segment are classified as core cells, and not all the cells in the service area. An amendment to claim 31 along the same lines is present.


Finally, because claim 1 recites a process with respect to a single grid segment, (the claimed process may be repeated if there are multiple grid segments), claim 6 has been amended accordingly so as to recite “classifying ~~each~~ at least one remaining unassigned cell as a daily cell.”

Applicant will also be submitting an IDS shortly for consideration by the Examiner, and requests that the Examiner check for the existence of the IDS and consider it, along with any remarks that may be submitted, before responding to the above amendments.

Conclusion

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.


Respectfully submitted,



Karl Koster

Registration No. 50,684

<p>Customer No. 00826 <b>ALSTON &amp; BIRD LLP</b> Bank of America Plaza 101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000 Charlotte, NC 28280-4000 Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000 Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777</p>	<p><b>CERTIFICATION OF ELECTRONIC FILING</b> I hereby certify that this paper is being filed via the Electronic Filing System (EFS) to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.  Shana Moore</p>
--	--

  
Date

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON February 15, 2007.